arXiv:1404.3442v1 [cs.GT] 14 Apr 2014

# Pure Nash Equilibrium in Capacitated Selfish Replication (CSR) Game*

Seyed Rasoul Etesami, Tamer Başar

Coordinated Science Laboratory, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801

Email: (etesami1, basar1)@illinois.edu

**Abstract**

We consider the capacitated selfish replication game with binary preferences. We first devise an algorithm which can reach a pure Nash equilibrium on trees after $n$ steps where $n$ is the number of nodes (players) in the game. Introducing an ordinal potential function for such a game, we determine the convergence rate of the best response dynamics to a pure Nash equilibrium based on the radii of the updating agents. Using this potential function, we propose a least best response dynamics. We prove polynomial time convergence of such dynamics to a pure Nash equilibrium for general graphs when the number of resources is limited or their edge density is high enough with respect to the number of resources. This partially answers a conjecture on the existence of PLS-hard algorithms for finding the equilibrium when the number of resources is more than 2. We show that the least best response dynamics improve the convergence speed of an earlier algorithm [1] in the case of two resources by a factor of at least $n^2$. We extend the results for the capacitated selfish replication games with arbitrary cache size and provide an effective allocation rule for extra capacities in the network in order to accelerate the least best response dynamics to an equilibrium in polynomial time. Finally, we make a comparison between graph coloring and the set of equilibria of the capacitated selfish replication game.

**Index Terms**

Capacitated selfish replication game, pure Nash equilibrium, updating radius, best response dynamics, least best response dynamics, ordinal potential function, PLS-hard algorithms, graph coloring.

*Research supported in part by the "Cognitive & Algorithmic Decision Making" project grant through the College of Engineering of the University of Illinois, and in parts by AFOSR MURI Grant FA 9550-10-1-0573 and NSF grant CCF 11-11342.

## I. Introduction

Distributed systems and social networks constitute an important area of research, which has attracted a lot of attention in the past few years [2], [3], [4] and [5]. Such social structures are used to study the relationships between individuals, groups and organizations when they act as members of a society, and have emerged in a variety of disciplines such as economics, computer science and statistics [6], [7], [8], [9] and [10]. With the appearance of game theory from one side and myriads of online social networks and availability of huge data sets on the other, modeling different phenomena under competitive distributed networks has gained a lot of attention in recent years [11], [12], [13]. Among many problems that arise in such contexts, distributed replication games not only improve the availability of resources for users, but also increase the reliability of the entire network with respect to customer requests [14], [15]. Pier-to-pier systems [16], [17] and web-caches [1] are some of the areas which are becoming more popular in this context.

Typically, resource allocation games are characterized by a set of agents who compete for the same set of resources [18], and arise in a wide variety of contexts such as congestion games [19], [20], and content management [21]. Moreover, allocation games have emerged widely in economics and market sharing [22], where a set of agents want to provide service to their costumers with a limited set of resources while there are different request rates for different resources and providers. The main challenge in market sharing games is whether the outcome of interactions between service providers modeled as a repeated game converges to a pure Nash equilibrium and how long it will take to converge.

The uncapacitated selfish replication game where the agents have access to all the resources was studied in [14], where the authors were able to characterize the set of equilibrium points based on the parameters of the problem. However, when the agents have limited capacity, the situation is more complicated, as this will bring restrictions on the actions of the players, more pronounced than in the uncapacitated case. Unlike the uncapacitated case, there is no such a nice characterization of the equilibrium points in hand for the capacitated selfish replication games. Finding an equilibrium for such games in the case of a hierarchical network was studied in [1]. Typically, capacitated selfish replication games are defined using a set of available resources for each player while the players can communicate through an undirected communication graph. Such a communication graph identifies the access cost among the players and the goal for each

player is to satisfy his/her customers' needs with minimum cost. Ideally, and in order to avoid any additional cost, each player only wants to provide his/her own set of resources. However, due to limited capacity, players do not have access to all the resources and hence, they incur some cost by borrowing some of the resources which are not available in their own caches from others in order to provide to their customers.

In this paper, we consider the capacitated selfish replication game where agents can only allocate a unit size of resources, and in more specific form, we analyze the binary preference version of such games in which each player is equally interested in a set of resources. In this model players will act myopically and selfishly, while they are imposed to fully satisfy their customers' needs. In other words, although the players act in a selfish manner with respect to others, to satisfy their customer needs, their actions closely depend on the others' and they do not have absolute freedom in the selection of their actions.

The paper is organized as follows: in Section II, we introduce the capacitated selfish replication game model (CSR) in a general framework and under binary object preferences, and provide an overview of some of the basic properties of such games. In Section III, we propose an algorithm based on the best response dynamics, which can achieve an equilibrium after $n$ steps for the tree configuration as the underlying network, where $n$ is the number of players in the game. In Section IV, we develop some preliminary results for later use. Based on these results we introduce least best response dynamics. In Section V, we apply the least best response dynamics for general graphs and show that such dynamics can reach a pure Nash equilibrium very fast either when the number of resources is limited or when the underlying graphs are relatively dense. In Section VI, we extend these results for the capacitated selfish replication game when the cache size can be greater than 1. Inserting extra caches to the network in order to accelerate the convergence rate of the dynamics, we locate the effective nodes and their extra cache size by solving a linear program. Implementing these results for some simple networks, we observe that adding extra links to the network will decrease the need for extra caches. In Section VII, we observe some similarities between the set of proper vertex coloring of the graphs and the set of Nash equilibria of the CSR game. We conclude the paper in Section VIII.

**Notation**: For a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we let $\mathbf{v}_i$ be the $i$th entry of $\mathbf{v}$. We use $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ for an undirected underlying network with a node set $\mathcal{V}$ and an edge set $\mathcal{E}$. For any two nodes $i, j \in \mathcal{V}$, we let $d_{\mathcal{G}}(i, j)$ be the graphical distance between them, that is, the length of a shortest path which

connects $i$ and $j$. The diameter of the graph, denoted by $D$, is the maximum distance between any pair of vertices, that is, $D = \max_{u,v \in \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{G})} d_{\mathcal{G}}(u, v)$. Moreover, for an arbitrary node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ and an integer $r \geq 0$ we define a ball of radius $r$ and center $i$ to be the set of all the nodes in the graph $\mathcal{G}$ whose graphical distance is at most $r$ to the node $i$, i.e. $B_{\mathcal{G}}(i, r) = \{x \in \mathcal{V} | d_{\mathcal{G}}(i, x) \leq r\}$. We let $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{R}$ denote the sets of integer and real numbers, respectively. Moreover, we let $\mathbb{Z}^D$ be the set of all vectors of dimension $D$ with integer valued entries. For any two vectors $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ in $\mathbb{Z}^D$, we write $\mathbf{u} \leq \mathbf{v}$ if $\mathbf{u}$ is lexicographically smaller than $\mathbf{v}$. We let $e_i$ denote the standard $i$th unit Euclidean vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (with 1 in $i$th location and 0's elsewhere), and $\mathbf{1}$ denote a column vector with all entries equal to 1.

## II. Game Model

### A. CSR game in general form

We start with a set of $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ nodes (players) which are connected by an undirected underlying graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$. We denote the set of all resources by $O = \{o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_k\}$. We assume that each node $i$ has a weight $\omega_i(o)$ for each object $o$ representing the rate at which $i$ accesses $o$. Assuming that $P_i(t)$ denotes the allocated resource by node $i$ at time $t = 1, 2, \ldots$, we let $P(t) = (P_1(t), P_2(t), \ldots, P_n(t))$ be the allocation vector at time $t$. We remove the dependence on time $t$ whenever there is no ambiguity. For a particular allocation $P = (P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_n)$, we define the sum utility function $U_i(P)$ as follows:

$$U_i(P) = -\sum_{o \in O} \omega_i(o) d_{\mathcal{G}}(i, \sigma_i(P, o)),$$

where $\sigma_i(P, o)$ is $i's$ nearest node holding $o$ in $P$. Moreover, given an allocation profile $P$ at some time $t$ we call $d_{\mathcal{G}}(i, \sigma_i(P, P_i))$ to be the *radius* of agent $i$ at that time. We assume that all objects are of identical size and that each node's cache holds exactly one object.

### B. Binary object preference setting

In the binary object preference setting, each node $i$ has a set $S_i$ of objects he or she is equally interested in and has no interest in other objects. Therefore, the rate of request for all the resources in $S_i$ are the same and this means that by normalization, agents can assume that their resource rates are all equal to 1 in their cost computations. Therefore, the players only need to pay attention on allocation distances on the graph. In other words, in order to maximize

the payoffs, each agent needs to maximize his corresponding radius $d_{\mathcal{G}}(i, \sigma_i(P, P_i))$. It has been shown before [1] that CSR games under binary preferences are potential games, and hence admit a pure Nash equilibrium. Also, it is known that when there are only two different resources in the game, i.e. $O = \{o_1, o_2\}$, there exists a polynomial time algorithm of $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ which converges to a pure Nash equilibrium of the game. Henceforth, we assume that all the agents are equally interested in all the objects, i.e. $S_i = O$ for all $i$. We will see later that relaxing $S_i$ to be equal to $O$ not only does not increase the complexity of reaching equilibrium, but also, may result in more freedom for agents, making the dynamics converge faster.

## III. Equilibrium Seeking for Trees

In this section we provide an algorithm which inductively constructs a pure Nash equilibrium for an arbitrary tree structure as the underlying network in the game. In this algorithm we start from a reference node (root) and move through all the other nodes of the tree one by one by allocating appropriate resources such that none of the preceding already allocated nodes have incentive to deviate in the future. The important fact that we exploit here is that there exists one unique path between every two nodes of a tree.

**Theorem 1.** *Assume that $\mathcal{G}$ is a tree of $n$ nodes in the CSR game with $O = \{o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_k\}$. Then, there is a polynomial time algorithm that constructs an equilibrium after $n$ steps.*

*Proof:* Let us start from an arbitrary node as a root and label it by 1. We define $L_r$ ($r$th level) to be the set of all nodes in $\mathcal{G}$ which have distance $r$ from node 1. At each step of the algorithm we choose an agent in the highest level which has not been chosen before and let her allocate one resource based on her best response to all the agents who have updated before. If there are multiple resources for her as the best response, she will choose the one with minimum index. We show that when all the agents update their resources, we will reach an equilibrium. For a proof by contradiction let assume that $v$ is the first agent during this process whose update results in one of the preceding agents, $u$, to deviate. This situation is illustrated in Figure 1. Without loss of generality let us assume $P_v = \{o_1\}$. Then, $u$ must have had the same resource i.e. $P_u = \{o_1\}$ as otherwise, allocating $o_1$ by $v$ does not affect the optimality of $P_u$ with respect to the most recent updated agents, i.e. $1, 2, \ldots v-1, v$. Since $u$ wants to deviate, there must be another resource, say $o_2$, such that $\min_{x=1,\ldots v, x\neq u}\{d(u,x) : P_x = \{o_2\}\} > d(u,v)$, as otherwise,

there is no incentive for her to deviate. Thus, if $w \in \text{argmin}_{x=1,\dots v, x\neq v}\{d(v,x) : P_x = \{o_2\}\}$, then $d(u,w) > d(u,v)$. Consider the unique paths from $v$ to $u$ and from $v$ to $w$, and let $z$ be the lowest agent that they have in common. By the updating scheme, we know that $w$ must be in a higher level than or at least the same level as $v$, i.e. $d(v,z) \geq d(w,z)$. Thus we can write




Fig. 1: Sample configuration of nodes in Theorem 1

$$\begin{aligned} d(u,w) &> d(u,v) = d(u,z) + d(z,v) \\ &\geq d(u,z) + d(z,w) = d(u,w). \end{aligned}$$

This contradiction leads to the conclusion that during the updating process none of the preceding agents have any incentive to deviate and hence at the end of the precess we end up with an equilibrium. ■

In the next section we turn our attention to the CSR game with binary preferences over general networks. It has been shown before [1] that such a game admits an ordinary potential function. Here we construct a new form for such a function in order to facilitate our analysis.

## IV. Ordinary Potential Function

We start this section with the following definition.

**Definition 1.** *Given a profile of allocations at time $t$ by $P(t) = (P_1(t), \dots, P_n(t))$ on a graph $\mathcal{G}$ with diameter $D$, define a radius vector by $n(t) = (n_1(t), n_2(t), \dots, n_D(t))$, where $n_r(t),\ r = 1, \dots, D$ is the number of agents who have radius $r$ with respect to the profile $P(t)$. Also, let $N_r(t)$ to be the set of all agents at time $t$ whose radius is $r$, that is, $|N_r(t)| = n_r(t)$.*

**Lemma 1.** *In the binary preference CSR game with $|O|$ number of resources, assume that at time step $t$ an agent $i$ whose radius is $r$ updates her resource based on the best response. Then $n(t+1)$ will have the following form*

$$\Big(n_1(t), \ldots, n_{r-1}(t), n_r(t) - \alpha, n_{r+1}(t+1), \ldots, n_D(t+1)\Big),$$

*where $\alpha$ is an integer greater than 0.*

*Proof:* Assume that agent $i$ wants to deviate at time $t$ and $P_i(t) = \{a\}$. Moreover, let us assume that she will deviate to some $\{b\}$ at the next time step in order to increase her radius, that is $P_i(t+1) = \{b\}$. Without any loss of generality, we may assume $i \in N_r(t)$ for some $r \in \{1, 2, \ldots, D-1\}$. After updating, agent $i$ will leave the set $N_r(t)$ to another set $N_{r'}(t+1)$ at the next time step by increasing her radius to some $r' > r$. Now we show that

$$N_k(t) = N_k(t+1), \quad 1 \leq k \leq r-1$$
$$N_r(t+1) \leq N_r(t) - 1.$$

First assume that $j \in N_k(t)$ for some $1 \leq k \leq r-1$. This means that the radius of $j$ which we denote by $r_j(t)$ is less than $r$. We consider three cases:

- $P_j(t) \notin \{a, b\}$: In this case updating $i$ does not affect the radius of $j$ and agent $j$ will remain in her own set at the next time step, i.e. $j \in N_k(t+1)$.
- $P_j(t) = \{a\}$: In this case since $r_j(t) = k < r$, then the radius of $j$ is determined by another agent except $i$. Therefore updating $i$ from $\{a\}$ to $\{b\}$ does not affect the radius of $j$ and agent $j$ will remain in her own set, i.e. $j \in N_k(t+1)$.
- $P_j(t) = \{b\}$: In this case we can similarly argue that the radius of agent $j$ is determined by another agent who has some radius $k < r$. But since after updating $i$ from $\{a\}$ to $\{b\}$, agent $i$'s radius will increase to $r' > r$, and since $P_j(t) = \{b\}$, we conclude that the graphical distance between $j$ and $i$ must be at least $r'$. Since we already know $r' > r > k$, this shows that updating $i$ cannot affect the radius of $j$, i.e. $j \in N_k(t+1)$.

From all the above cases we observe that if the radius of an agent is less than $r$ before updating agent $i$, then it will remain the same at the next time step, i.e. $N_k(t+1) \subseteq N_k(t), 1 \leq k \leq r-1$.

Next we show that if the radius of an agent $\ell$ is greater than $r$, i.e. $\ell \in N_s(t)$ for some $s > r$, then after updating $i$, it cannot reduce to something less than or equal to $r$ at the next time step. Again, we consider three cases:

- $P_\ell(t) \notin \{a, b\}$: In this case updating $i$ does not affect the radius of $\ell$ and thus $\ell$ will remain in her own set at the next time step, i.e. $\ell \in N_s(t+1)$.
- $P_\ell(t) = \{a\}$: In this case and after updating $i$ from $\{a\}$ to $\{b\}$ the radius of $\ell$ not only does not decrease but also it may increase. In other words, not only $j$ will not move to one of the sets with smaller radius, but also she may move to another set with larger radius.
- $P_\ell(t) = \{b\}$: In this case the graphical distance between $\ell$ and $i$ must be at least $r'$ as otherwise, updating $i$ from $\{a\}$ to $\{b\}$ will not increase $i$'s radius to $r'$. This shows that updating $i$ cannot reduce $r_\ell$ to $r$ or less.

Based on the above argument we observe that $n(t+1)$ has the following representation, where $\alpha$ is an integer greater than or equal to 1.

$$\Big(n_1(t), \ldots, n_{r-1}(t), n_r(t) - \alpha, n_{r+1}(t+1), \ldots, n_D(t+1)\Big).$$

■

From Lemma 1 we can conclude that the binary CSR game is a potential game as was discussed in [1]. In fact, the radius vector corresponding to the game will decrease lexicographically after each best response update. Thus, as a naive upper bound for the convergence time, one can note that since $\sum_{p=1}^{D} n_p(t) = n$ for all $t$, the maximum number of updating steps before reaching an equilibrium can be upper bounded by the number of non-negative integer solutions of

$$X_1 + X_2 + \ldots + X_D = n,$$

which is equal to $\binom{n+D-1}{D-1}$ where $D$ is the diameter of the graph $\mathcal{G}$. As it has been pointed out in [12] and [23], a random graph with $n$ vertices where each edge appears with probability $p$, has with high probability diameter at most 2 whenever $p \geq \sqrt{\frac{c \ln n}{n}}$ for $c > 2$. In particular by taking p =1/2 almost all graphs over $n$ vertices have diameter at most 2. Finally, social networks typically have a very small diameter. Therefore, the convergence speed of best response dynamics for the CSR game over social networks with low diameter are fast.

In fact, a closer look at the proof of Lemma 1 tells us something more about the changes in the radius vector. Assuming that agent $i$ updates from radius $r$ to $r' > r$ at some time $t$, the radius of all the other agents with radius larger than $r'$ cannot decrease below $r'$. In other words,

$r'$ is a threshold that agents' radii cannot fall below after updating $i$. In the following we give a quantitative measure of how fast the best response dynamics will converge to an equilibrium based on the radius of the agents who update at each time step. We start with the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.** *In the CSR game, let $i \in N_r(t)$ be an agent who updates from $\{a\}$ to $\{b\}$ by increasing her radius to $r'$. Assume that this update decreases the radii of $s$ other agents $i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_s$ from their corresponding radii $r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \ldots \leq r_s$ to $r'$. Then,*

$$r' + r_1 + r_2 + \ldots + r_s \leq 2n,$$

*and in particular $s + 1 \leq \frac{2n}{r+2}$.*

*Proof:* Note that since the radii of agents $i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_s$ decrease by updating the agent $i$ from $\{a\}$ to $\{b\}$, all of these agents have allocated $\{b\}$, i.e. $P_{i_k}(t) = P_{i_k}(t+1) = \{b\}, k = 1, 2, \ldots s$. We prove the Lemma by using the following three facts.

- Fact (1): Since after updating agent $i$ we know that agents $i_k, k = 1 \ldots s$ with corresponding radii $r_k$ will have radius $r'$, their graphical distance to $i$ must be equal to $r'$, i.e. $d_{\mathcal{G}}(i_k, i) = r'$.
- Fact (2): For any $j, k \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$ if the shortest path between $i_j$ and $i$ intersects the shortest path between $i_k$ to $i$ at some point $z$, then $d_{\mathcal{G}}(z, i_k) = d_{\mathcal{G}}(z, i_j)$.
- Fact(3): Since all the nodes $i_k$ have the same resource $\{b\}$, and possibly different radii at time $t$, $d_{\mathcal{G}}(i_j, i_k) \geq \max\{r_j, r_k\}$.

Now, for each $k \in \{1, \ldots s\}$, let us denote one of the shortest paths from $i_k$ to $i$ by $\mathcal{T}_k$ and let us assume that $z_k$ is the first vertex where $\mathcal{T}_k$ intersects $\cup_{x \neq k} \mathcal{T}_x$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $z_k$ is located on $\mathcal{T}_{k^*}$. Therefore, the sub-path $\mathcal{T}_k(i_k \to z_k)$ from $i_k$ to $z_k$ contains vertices which are different from all other paths, i.e. $\cup_{x \neq k} \mathcal{T}_x$. Furthermore, in view of Facts (1) and (2), the shortest path from $i_{k^*}$ to $z_k$ must have the same length as the shortest path from $i_k$ to $z_k$, i.e. $|\mathcal{T}_{k^*}(i_{k^*} \to z_k)| = |\mathcal{T}_k(i_k \to z_k)|$. Now, using Fact (3) we can write

$$\begin{aligned} r_k &\leq \max\{r_k, r_{k^*}\} \leq d_{\mathcal{G}}(i_k, i_{k^*}) \\ &\leq |\mathcal{T}_{k^*}(i_{k^*} \to z_k)| + |\mathcal{T}_k(i_k \to z_k)| \\ &= 2|\mathcal{T}_k(i_k \to z_k)|. \end{aligned}$$

This means that $|\mathcal{T}_k(i_k \to z_k)| > \frac{r_k}{2}$. However, we know that all the vertices on $\mathcal{T}_k(i_k \to z_k)$ only belong to $\mathcal{T}_k$ and no other path $\mathcal{T}_x, x \neq k$. Therefore $\cup_{x=1}^{s} \mathcal{T}_x$ must have at least

$\frac{1}{2}(r' + r_1 + r_2 + \ldots + r_s)$ nodes, where the extra term $r'$ is because of the path from $i$ to $\sigma_i(P, P_i)$. On the other side, we know that the total number of agents is $n$ and thus we must have $\frac{1}{2}(r' + r_1 + r_2 + \ldots + r_s) \leq n$. Finally, since $r < r' < r_1 \leq \ldots \leq r_s$, we have $s + 1 \leq \frac{2n}{r+2}$ and this completes the proof. ■

**Theorem 2.** *In the CSR game, suppose that an agent who has radius $r(t)$ updates his resource at time $t$. Moreover, let $n$ and $T$ denote, respectively, the number of agents and the number of best response updates before reaching an equilibrium. Then*

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} (\frac{1}{n})^{r(t)} < 3.$$

*Proof:* Let us introduce a potential function:

$$V(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{D} n_i(t) n^{D-i},$$

where $D$ is the diameter of $\mathcal{G}$. Suppose that at time step $t$ an agent $i \in N_r(t)$ updates his radius from $r(t)$ to $r' > r(t)$. Using Lemma 1 we can write

$$\begin{aligned} V(t) - V(t+1) &= \alpha n^{D-r} + \sum_{i=r}^{D} \big(n_i(t) - n_i(t+1)\big) n^{D-i} \\ &\geq n^{D-r} + \sum_{i=r}^{D} \big(n_i(t) - n_i(t+1)\big) n^{D-i} \\ &= n^{D-r} + \sum_{i=r}^{r'} \big(n_i(t) - n_i(t+1)\big) n^{D-i} + \sum_{i=r'+1}^{D} \big(n_i(t) - n_i(t+1)\big) n^{D-i}. \quad (1) \end{aligned}$$

Now let us assume that agent $i$ updates from $\{a\}$ to $\{b\}$. Due to this update, and in the worst case scenario, the amount of decrease in the potential function given in (1) will be minimized when $r' = r + 1$ and all the $s$ agents who have radii $r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \ldots \leq r_s$ decrease their radii to $r'$. Now we can write

$$\begin{aligned} V(t) - V(t+1) &\geq n^{D-r} + n^{D-r_1} + \ldots + n^{D-r_s} - n^{D-(r+1)} - s n^{D-(r+1)} \\ &= n^{D-r} \Big(1 + n^{r-r_1} + \ldots + n^{r-r_s} - (s+1) n^{-1}\Big) > n^{D-r} \Big(1 - \frac{(s+1)}{n}\Big). \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} nn^{D-1} &\geq V(1) \geq V(1) - V(T+1) \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^{T} \big(V(t) - V(t+1)\big) \\ &> \sum_{t=1}^{T} n^{D-r(t)} \Big(1 - \frac{(s(t)+1)}{n}\Big) \\ &\geq \sum_{t=1}^{T} n^{D-r(t)} \Big(1 - \frac{2}{r(t)+2}\Big), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we have used the result of Lemma 2 as an upper bound for $s+1$. By simplifying both sides of the above inequality we get

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} n^{-r(t)} \Big(1 - \frac{2}{r(t)+2}\Big) < 1.$$

Finally, since $r(t) \geq 1$ for all $t$, $1 - \frac{2}{r(t)+2} \geq 1 - \frac{2}{3} = \frac{1}{3}$. Substituting this relation in the above inequality we get:

$$\sum_{t=1}^{T} (\frac{1}{n})^{r(t)} < 3.$$

■

From Theorem 2 one can see that the speed of convergence is highly dependent on the radius of the updating agent at each time instant. In other words, the lower the radius of updating, the more contribution to the speed of convergence to an equilibrium. Based on this observation we introduce new dynamics in the next section.

## V. Least Best Response Dynamics

We start this section with the following definition.

**Definition 2.** *Given a CSR game, at each time $t = 1, 2, \ldots$, and from all the agents who want to update, we select an agent with the least radius (utility) and let her update be based on her best response. If there are multiple agents as candidate at time $t$, we choose one of them arbitrarily. We refer to such dynamics as least best response dynamics.*

Based on the above definition we can prove the following lemma for the least best response dynamics.

**Lemma 3.** *Let $|O|$ denote the number of resources in the CSR game. Then, in the least best response dynamics, we have $r(t) \leq |O| - 1, \forall t$, where $r(t)$ is the radius of the updating agent at time step $t$.*

*Proof:* In order to reach a contradiction, let suppose that there exists a time instant $t$ such that $r(t) \geq |O|$. Based on the least best response dynamics, this can happen if all the agents with radii smaller than $r(t)$ are playing their best response. Now assume that an agent $i$ has radius $r(t) \geq |O|$ and she wants to update her resource. We claim that every two nodes in the shortest path between $i$ and the closest agent to him who has the same resource ($j = \sigma_i(P(t), P_i(t))$) must have different resources (Figure 2). Otherwise, if $\ell$ and $\ell'$ have the same resource $\{x\}$, then the radius of $\ell$ denoted by $r_\ell$ will be smaller than $r(t)$. Since all the agents who have distance at most $r_\ell$ to $\ell$ will have distance smaller than $r(t)$ to $i$, none of them can have $\{a\}$ as their resource. This means that $\ell$ can improve her radius by allocating $\{a\}$, which is in contradiction with the fact that all the agents with radii smaller than $r(t)$ are playing their best response. Therefore, none of the agents on the shortest path between $i$ and $j$ (except $i$ and $j$) and the node in which $i$ wants to update to its resource can have the same resource. Since the total number of resources is $|O|$, we must have $r(t) + 1 \leq |O|$.




Fig. 2: Maximum radius of updates

■

**Corollary 1.** *As a result of Lemma 3 and Theorem 2, we have:*

$$T \leq 3n^{|O|-1}.$$

We now have another lemma which will be useful in the proof of our main result.

**Lemma 4.** *In the least best response dynamics, suppose that an agent $i \in N_r(t)$ updates from $\{a\}$ to $\{b\}$ and thus increases her radius to $r' > r$. If there exists an agent $\ell \in \cup_{j=1}^{r-1} N_j(t)$ who is playing her best response but has an incentive to deviate after updating $i$, then $|O| \geq 5$.*

*Proof:* Without any loss of generality we may assume $\ell \in N_k(t)$ for some $1 \leq k < r$. Also, let $\ell'$ be the nearest node to $\ell$ with the same resource, i.e. $\ell' = \sigma_\ell(P(t), P_\ell(t))$ and $P_\ell(t) = P_{\ell'}(t) = \{c\}$ for some resource $\{c\}$. Note that in order for player $i$'s deviation to affect $\ell$, she must be within a graphical distance of at most $k$ from $\ell$, i.e. $d_{\mathcal{G}}(i, \ell) \leq k$. Also, note that $d(i, \ell) + k \geq r'$, since otherwise, $\ell$ would be able to deviate to $\{b\}$ and increase her radius even before updating $i$. But based on the least best response dynamics, this means that $\ell$ should have updated instead of $i$. Now combining these two relations we can write $k \geq \frac{r'}{2}$. Gathering all together, we can write

$$1 \leq d(i, \ell) \leq k < r < r', \quad k \geq \frac{r'}{2}. \tag{3}$$

Since $k$ is an integer, we conclude that $k \geq 2$.

Next we note that $c \notin \{a, b\}$. For if $c = b$, then there is no incentive for $i$ to deviate from $a$ to $b$. Moreover, if $c = a$, then $r \leq d_{\mathcal{G}}(i, \ell)$ which is in contradiction with (3). Moreover, since we know that agent $\ell$ was playing her best response before updating $i$, it means that all the resources has appeared at least once in $B(\ell, k)$. In addition, since updating $i$ from $\{a\}$ to $\{b\}$ creates this incentive for $\ell$ to deviate, the only way is that $\ell$ evicts $\{c\}$ and inserts $\{a\}$. Furthermore, since this will lead to an increase in her radius from $k$ to something larger, it is not hard to see that the minimum number of resources for a such situation to arise with $d_{\mathcal{G}}(i, \ell) = k = 2, r = 3, r' = 4$ is with at least 6 different resources which is shown in Figure 3. Thus $|O| \geq 5$ and this proves the Lemma. ■

**Theorem 3.** *In the binary CSR game with $n$ agents and $|O| < 5$, the least best response dynamics will converge to a pure Nash Equilibrium in no longer than $n \min\{|O| - 1, D\}$ steps, where $D$ is the diameter of the graph.*

*Proof:* Suppose that at time $t$ an agent $i \in N_r(t)$ updates its resource from $\{a\}$ to $\{b\}$ and therefore moves to $N_{r'}(t+1)$ for some $r' > r$. Based on the least best response, $i$ is an unsatisfied agent who has the least radius. It means that all the elements in $\cup_{k=1}^{r-1} N_r(t)$ are playing their best response with respect to $P(t)$. We claim that all the elements in $\cup_{k=1}^{r-1} N_r(t)$ will still play




Fig. 3: Realization of Lemma 4 with minimum number of resources

their best response with respect to $P(t+1)$. To show that, let us assume that $\ell \in \cup_{k=1}^{r-1} N_r(t)$. Without any loss of generality we may assume that $\ell \in N_k(t) = N_k(t+1)$ for some $k < r$, where the equality is because of Lemma 1. We observe that after updating $i$ from $\{a\}$ to $\{b\}$ the only reason why $\ell$ would not be playing her best response in $P(t+1)$ anymore is that either one of the following two situations occurs:

- (1): $P_\ell(t+1) = \{b\}$ and after updating $i$ from $\{a\}$ to $\{b\}$, player $\ell$ thinks that either her radius has been decreased or she can increase it by allocating some other resource.
- (2): (*bad case*) $\ell$ wants to deviate from her current state ($P_\ell(t+1)$) to $\{a\}$ because she thinks that after updating $i$ from $\{a\}$ to $\{b\}$ she might be able to increase her radius from $k$ to something larger by allocating $\{a\}$. Such case is illustrated in Figure 4.




Fig. 4: Illustration of the bad case

We first show that (1) cannot happen. Toward that end, note that $d_{\mathcal{G}}(\ell, i) > k$ as otherwise after updating $i$ to resource $\{b\}$ her radius would be less than or equal to $d_{\mathcal{G}}(\ell, i)$ which is

less than $r$. This is in contradiction with the fact that agent $i$'s radius will increase after her update. Now we know that there are fewer of resources $\{b\}$ in profile $P(t)$ than $P(t+1)$ ($P_i(t) = \{a\}, P_i(t+1) = \{b\}$). Since agent $\ell$'s best response was to choose $\{b\}$ in $P(t)$ with corresponding radius $k$ and $d(\ell, i) > k$, her best response will be the same as before at the next time step, i.e. $P_\ell(t+1) = \{b\}$. This shows that case (1) cannot happen. Finally, using Lemma 4, and since $|O| < 5$, we can see that the second case cannot happen either.

What we have shown so far is that under the least best response dynamics if at some time $t$ the minimum updating radius is $r$ then all the agents who have radii less than $r$ will still play their best responses. Moreover, using Lemma 1, we can see that when the radius of updating at time $t$ is $r$, after at most $n_r(t)$ steps the radius of updating will increase by at least 1 (because all the agents with radii less than $r$ will stay with their best response and they will not move away from their own radius sets). Since $r$ can be at most $\min\{|O| - 1, D\}$ and $n_r(t) \leq n$ for all $t$, by Lemma 3 we conclude that after at most $n \min\{|O| - 1, D\}$ steps we will reach an equilibrium. ■

As a corollary of the above theorem we can see that in the case of two resources, the least best response dynamics converges in no longer than $n$ steps, which is faster than the algorithm proposed in [1] by a factor of at least $n^2$. Also, we note that the only reason why the result of the above theorem may not extend to $|O| \geq 5$ is that case (2) (bad case) can still occur. Our conjecture at this point is that this is a very rare case and can happen only a small number of times. Indeed if the number of occurrences of bad cases is bounded from above by $B$, then the least best response dynamics will converge to an equilibrium in no longer than $nB \min\{|O| - 1, D\}$ time steps.

The following theorem now says that the least best response dynamics converge fast on relatively dense graphs.

**Theorem 4.** *In the binary CSR game with $n$ agents and with $d_{\min} \geq |O|$, the least best response dynamics will converge to a pure Nash equilibrium in no longer than $3n^3 \min\{|O| - 1, D\}$ steps, where $d_{\min}$ denotes the minimum degree in the graph $\mathcal{G}$.*

*Proof:* We show that if $d_{\min} \geq |O|$, then the number of bad cases that can happen during the dynamics is at most $3n^2$. Also, as in the case of Theorem 3 we argue that since the gap between any two consecutive occurrences of bad cases can be at most $n \min\{|O| - 1, D\}$, the overall

the dynamics will terminate at an equilibrium in no longer than $3n^2 \times n \min\{|O|-1, D\} = 3n^3 \min\{|O|-1, D\}$ steps. First using Theorem 2 we observe that the number of bad updates with $r(t) = k = 2$ cannot be greater than $3n^2$. Except that, all the other updates will have radii larger than or equal to 3. It then remains to show that when $r(t) \geq 3$ for some $t$, this update cannot be a bad update. In fact when $d_{\min} \geq |O|$, at least two of the neighbors of $\ell$, say $j$ and $j'$, will have the same resources and hence their radii will be at most 2. Therefore, $j$ can increase her radius by updating to $\{a\}$. But we know that the updating radius at time $t$ is $r(t) \geq 3$ while $j$ is an agent with a smaller radius who wants to deviate. This is in contradiction with the least best response dynamics. Therefore after at most $3n^2$ windows of time, each of length at most $n \min\{|O|-1, D\}$, which may possibly include some bad cases, no other bad case can happen and the dynamics will terminate at an equilibrium. ■

## VI. Binary CSR Game with Different Capacities

Heretofore we have assumed that the capacity of each agent is exactly 1. In the following we generalize our results when this capacity is allowed to be possibly different for different agents. To be more precise, let us assume that agent $i$'s capacity is $C_i$ where $1 \leq C_i \leq |O|$. Similarly, for a particular allocation profile $P = (P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_n)$ we define the sum utility function $U_i(P)$ as follows:

$$U_i(P) = \sum_{o \in P_i} d_{\mathcal{G}}(i, \sigma_i(P, o)), \tag{4}$$

where $\sigma_i(P, o)$ is $i's$ nearest node holding $o$ in $P$. We next show that as before the resulting game is a potential game and we examine the convergence speed of the least best response dynamics of that game.

**Theorem 5.** *The CSR game with variable capacities is a potential game. Moreover, if $C = \sum_{i=1}^{n} C_i$ and $T$ denote respectively the maximum capacity of the agents and the convergence time of the least best response dynamics, then*

$$T \leq \begin{cases} 3C^3 \min\{D, |O|-1\}, & \textit{if} \quad |O| \leq C_{\min} d_{\min} \\ C \min\{D, |O|-1\}, & \textit{if} \quad |O| < 5, \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

*where $C_{\min} = \min_{i=1\ldots n} C_i$.*

*Proof:* We replace each agent $i$ with capacity $C_i$ with $C_i$ new nodes each with capacity 1. We treat all of these $C_i$ new nodes as node $i$ and very naturally we connect them to all the other nodes where $i$ was connected before. Figure 5 depicts such a scenario. Now, if an agent $i$ with $P_i(t) = \{o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_k\}$ wants to update to $P_i(t+1) = \{o_{i_1}, o_{i_2}, \ldots, o_{i_k}\}$ based on her better response, then we must have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} d_{\mathcal{G}}(i, \sigma_i(P(t), o_j)) < \sum_{j=1}^{k} d_{\mathcal{G}}(i, \sigma_i(P(t), o_{\ell_j})).$$

This shows that there exists at least one agent $j^*$ such that

$$d_{\mathcal{G}}(i, \sigma_i(P(t), o_j^*)) < d_{\mathcal{G}}(i, \sigma_i(P(t), o_{\ell_{j^*}})).$$

In other words, if agent $i$ wants to deviate, there is at least one resource $o_{j^*}$ in her cache such that by evicting this resource and inserting $o_{\ell_{j^*}}$ she can increase her payoff. This means that at least one of the new nodes representing $i$ wants to deviate. Therefore, finding an equilibrium on this new network is equivalent to finding an equilibrium for the unit size cache CSR game on the new network. Thus applying the least best response dynamics on the new network with unit size cache will result in an equilibrium for this game. Finally, collecting all the resources of the $C_i$ new agents as the allocation set of agent $i$ we will arrive at an equilibrium for general capacitated CSR game with different capacities. Therefore, all the previous results can be carried over to the new network. The only difference is that instead of $n$ nodes we will have $C$ nodes. Also, note that the minimum degree in the new graph will be at least $d_{\min}C_{\min}$. Thus substituting $C$ for $n$ and $d_{\min}C_{\min}$ for $d_{\min}$ in Theorems 3 and 4 will lead to the desired result in (5).

■

As a corollary of the above Theorem and by increasing the cache capacity of the agents, the least best response dynamics will converge to an equilibrium with faster rate. In other words, by increasing the agents' capacities from 1 to $\frac{|O|}{d_{\min}}$, we note that the least best response dynamics will converge after a polynomial number of steps. In fact, to obtain a fast convergence time, we do not have to increase the capacity of all the nodes; just increasing the capacity of the nodes that have degree $d_i < |O|$ to $\frac{|O|}{d_i}$ will guarantee polynomial convergence of the algorithm. Based on this argument, the faster convergence in the least best response dynamics will be achieved by increasing the capacity of those nodes in the network that have the least degrees.




Fig. 5: An example of the original CSR game and its equivalent CSR game with unit capacity per node

Now, as a network designer we can ask the following question: Given a network $\mathcal{G}$ what are the best nodes one can select so that by increasing their capacities one can guarantee that the least best response dynamics converge in polynomial time? In the following we formulate this problem as an integer programming problem. Relaxing this integer program to a linear program and rounding off real-valued solutions to the upper integer values, we find an almost tight expression for the minimum extra capacities and their corresponding locations in the network for fast convergence to an equilibrium. Let us denote the capacity of node $i$ by a variable $x_i$ where $x_i \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)'$. As discussed in the proof of Theorem 5, by expanding the network and replacing node $i$ with $x_i$ identical nodes each of unit capacity, the degree of each of these new nodes would be $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(\mathcal{G})} x_j$, where $\mathcal{N}_i(\mathcal{G})$ is the set of neighbors of node $i$ in $\mathcal{G}$. Moreover, in order to have a fast convergence to a Nash equilibrium in the least best response dynamics, we need to have (using Theorem 4)

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i(\mathcal{G})} x_j \geq |O|, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n. \tag{6}$$

Rewriting all the inequalities in (6) in a matrix form, we get $Ax \geq |O|\mathbf{1}$ where $A$ is the adjacency matrix of $\mathcal{G}$ and the inequality is entry-wise. Since we would like to assign the minimum number

of capacities to the agents, we end up with the following integer program:

$$\begin{aligned} \min & \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \\ s.t \quad & Ax \geq |O|\mathbf{1} \\ & x_i \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

In the above formulation, the capacities of the agents are restricted to be integer valued. However, we can relax the integer program (7) by assuming $x_i \in [1, \infty)$. Substituting $y = x - \mathbf{1}$ in the relaxed version of (7), we arrive at the following linear program

$$\begin{aligned} & n + \min \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i \\ s.t \quad & Ay \geq |O|\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{d} \\ & y_i \geq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n)'$ is the vector of the degrees of the graph $\mathcal{G}$. In fact, the entries of $y$ denote the extra capacity needed to be added to each node in the network. Given a solution $y^*$ of (8), let $\lceil y^* \rceil$ be a vector which is obtained by rounding off the entries of $y^*$ to the closest integers greater than or equal to them. Note that since all the entries of $A$ are non-negative, $\lceil y^* \rceil$ is a feasible solution for (8) and hence we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 6.** *Given an arbitrary network $\mathcal{G}$ of $n$ nodes with adjacency matrix $A$ and a corresponding degree vector $\mathbf{d}$, let $\lceil y^* \rceil$ be an up-rounded integer solution of the linear program* (8)*. Then, the least best response dynamics will converge to an equilibrium of the CSR game in polynomial time $\mathcal{O}(n^3|O|^4)$ by adding $\lceil y_i^* \rceil$ extra cache for agent $i$.*

*Proof:* The proof simply follows from the discussion preceding the theorem. Since the maximum cache size for each agent is $|O|$, using Theorem 5 we get $C \leq n|O|$, and hence, $T \leq (n|O|)^3 \min\{D, |O| - 1\} \leq n^3|O|^4$. ■

As a particular result of Theorem 6, we note that for the uncapacitated selfish replication game when there is no restriction on the capacity of the agents, i.e. agents are allowed to store all finite number of available resources in their caches, the least best response dynamics converges to an equilibrium in polynomial time.

### A. A Numerical Example

In the following, we provide some numerical results of locating effective nodes in the network and adding extra capacities such that the least best response dynamics have faster convergence to an equilibrium. In Table I we show four different networks $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2, \mathcal{G}_3$ and $\mathcal{G}_4$ in an increasing order of edge density. We consider the CSR game on these networks with $|O| = 5$. In order to accelerate convergence to an equilibrium in each of these networks, we solve the linear program (8) for each of them to find the extra capacity $y_i$ needed for each agent. The numerical results are given in Table II. Each column of the table corresponds to a different network and each pair $(y_i^*, \lceil y_i^* \rceil)$ denotes the optimal extra capacity and the up-rounded integer extra capacity for agent $i$. Also, the last two rows of the Table II are related to the largest eigenvalue of each network and the total extra capacity needed, normalized by the number of agents in the network. It can be seen that as long as the densities of the networks are allowed to increase, the need for extra cache will tend to zero.

TABLE I: Configuration of Four Networks $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2, \mathcal{G}_3$ and $\mathcal{G}_4$ .



TABLE II: Solution of Linear Program (8) with $|O| = 5$ and for Networks $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2, \mathcal{G}_3$ and $\mathcal{G}_4$.

| Solutions | $\mathcal{G}_1$ | $\mathcal{G}_2$ | $\mathcal{G}_3$ | $\mathcal{G}_4$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $(y_1^*, \lceil y_1^* \rceil)$ | (0,0) | (0,0) | (0.38,1) | (0.32,1) |
| $(y_2^*, \lceil y_2^* \rceil)$ | (0,0) | (1.13,2) | (0.82,1) | (1.18,2) |
| $(y_3^*, \lceil y_3^* \rceil)$ | (3,3) | (1.87,2) | (0,0) | (0,0) |
| $(y_4^*, \lceil y_4^* \rceil)$ | (0,0) | (0,0) | (0.19,1) | (0,0) |
| $(y_5^*, \lceil y_5^* \rceil)$ | (4,4) | (4,4) | (0.78,1) | (0.5,1) |
| $(y_6^*, \lceil y_6^* \rceil)$ | (0,0) | (0,0) | (0.30,1) | (0,0) |
| $(y_7^*, \lceil y_7^* \rceil)$ | (4,4) | (4,4) | (1.49,2) | (0.5,1) |
| $(y_8^*, \lceil y_8^* \rceil)$ | (0,0) | (0,0) | (0,0) | (0,0) |
| $(y_9^*, \lceil y_9^* \rceil)$ | (4,4) | (3,3) | (3,3) | (0.5,1) |
| $(y_{10}^*, \lceil y_{10}^* \rceil)$ | (0,0) | (0,0) | (0,0) | (0.5,1) |
| $(y_{11}^*, \lceil y_{11}^* \rceil)$ | (0,0) | (0,0) | (0,0) | (0,0) |
| $\lambda_{\max}$ | 3.049 | 3.660 | 4.129 | 4.496 |
| $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n y_i}{n}$ | 1.3636 | 1.272 | 0.636 | 0.409 |

## VII. CSR Game and Graph Coloring

In this section we discuss some of the similarities between coloring of the graphs and equilibrium seeking of the binary CSR games.

Let us assume that there is a polynomial time algorithm which can deliver to a pure Nash equilibrium of the CSR game, which we denote by $P^* = (P_1^*, P_2^*, \dots P_n^*)$ where $P_i = \{o\}$ for some $o \in O$. Let us define $r_i^* = d_{i\sigma_i(P^*, P_i^*)} - 1$ and $r^* = \min_{i=1,\dots,n} r_i^*$.

Based on these definitions, we define a new graph $\mathcal{G}^{(r^*)}$ to have the same set of vertices as $\mathcal{G}$, and such that two nodes are connected in $\mathcal{G}^{(r^*)}$ if and only if the graphical distance between them in the original graph $\mathcal{G}$ is at most $r^*$. If we consider the set of resources as the colors with $|O| = k$, based on our construction it is not hard to see that $P^*$ is a $k$-proper coloring for $\mathcal{G}^{(r^*)}$. Since $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G}^{(1)}) \subseteq \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G}^{(2)}) \subseteq \ldots \subseteq \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G}^{(r^*)})$, $P^*$ is a $k$-proper coloring for $\mathcal{G}$ when $r^* > 0$. This leads to the following proposition.

**Proposition 7.** *If there exists a largest integer $h$ such that $\mathcal{G}^{(h)}$ has a $k$-proper coloring, then there exists an equilibrium $P^*$ for the CSR game such that $h = r^*$. Moreover, if the $k$-proper coloring in $\mathcal{G}^{(h)}$ is unique, then it is an equilibrium for the CSR game.*

*Proof:* Suppose that there is a $k$-proper coloring for $\mathcal{G}^{(h)}$. We use this allocation as an initial profile of the CSR game and start to update the agents' resources based on the least best response dynamics. Since we know that the game is potential and by Lemma 1 the radius of the smallest ball will not decrease during the least best response process, an equilibrium can be reached such that the radius of its smallest ball is at least as large as $h$. Furthermore, the radius of the smallest ball at the equilibrium must be less than $h+1$, as otherwise, the new equilibrium would be a $k$-proper coloring for $\mathcal{G}^{(h+1)}$, which is a contradiction. Therefore we must have $h = r^*$. Also, note that if $Q$ is the unique $k$-coloring for $\mathcal{G}^{(h)}$, setting the initial profile to be $Q$ in the least best response dynamics will lead to an equilibrium for the CSR game. This equilibrium, based on the above discussion, is a $k$-proper coloring for $\mathcal{G}^{(h)}$ which by assumption we know is unique. Therefore, $Q$ is an equilibrium. ■

Let us denote the set of pure Nash equilibria of the CSR game on the network $\mathcal{G}$ by $E(\mathcal{G})$ and the set of $k$-proper colorings of the graph $\mathcal{G}$ by $C(\mathcal{G})$. Using the same line of argument as in the proof of Proposition 7 we can see that if $C(\mathcal{G}) \neq \emptyset$, then starting from a coloring in $C(\mathcal{G})$ and applying the best response dynamics, it can be extended to an equilibrium which is still a valid $k$-proper coloring of $\mathcal{G}$. Therefore, if $C(\mathcal{G}) \neq \emptyset$, we must have $C(\mathcal{G}) \cap E(\mathcal{G}) \neq \emptyset$, and hence, we have the following corollary.

**Corollary 2.** *Assume that $\mathcal{G}$ has a unique $k$-proper coloring up to relabeling of the colors. Then, it must be an equilibrium for the CSR game. Moreover, if the CSR game has a unique equilibrium, then we can decide whether $\mathcal{G}$ is $k$-colorable or not.*

## VIII. Conclusion

In this paper, we have studied the capacitated selfish replication game with binary preferences. We provided a polynomial time algorithm $\mathcal{O}(n)$ for finding an equilibrium when the underlying network is a tree. By providing an ordinal potential function for such games in general form, we measured the speed of convergence to an equilibrium based on the updating radius at each time step. For general graphs, we introduced the least best response dynamics. We observed that these dynamics will drive to equilibrium in no longer than $n \min\{|O|-1, D\}$ steps when the number of resources is bounded by 5 ($|O| < 5$), and in no longer than $3n^3 \min\{|O|-1, D\}$ steps when the underlying graph is relatively dense, i.e. $d_{\min} \geq |O|$. This not only improves the algorithm proposed in [1], but also, partially answers some of the open questions in the field.

We showed that increasing the capacity of the agents can improve the speed of convergence of the dynamics to an equilibrium, and the location of effective nodes and the extra cache size can be found by solving a linear program. Finally, we noted some relations between coloring of graphs and the set of equilibria of binary $CSR$ games.

As future work, we are interested in precise computation of the maximum number of bad cases that can happen during the dynamics for an arbitrary number of resources, as we conjecture that it must be very low and bounded from above by a constant factor $B$. Moreover, in order to find an equilibrium in the binary CSR game, one can increase the cache sizes and recover an equilibrium very fast using the least best response dynamics. Therefore, one natural question is the relationship of this equilibrium to that of the unit size cache CSR game. For example, one may be able to construct an equilibrium for the unit size cache CSR game using an equilibrium of a CSR game with slightly higher capacities and use some majority rules in order to assign only one unit resourse to each player. Also the dynamic version of the $CSR$ game, as what has been discussed in [24] and [25], would be an interesting extension.

## REFERENCES


[1] R. Gopalakrishnan, D. Kanoulas, N. N. Karuturi, C. P. Rangan, R. Rajaraman, and R. Sundaram, "Cache me if you can: capacitated selfish replication games," in *LATIN 2012: Theoretical Informatics*. Springer, 2012, pp. 420–432.

[2] D. Kempe, J. Kleinberg, and É. Tardos, "Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network," in *Proceedings of the Ninth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. ACM, 2003, pp. 137–146.

[3] S. Etesami and T. Başar, "Convergence time for unbiased quantized consensus," *Proc. 52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control. CDC'13, Dec 10-13, 2013; Florence, Italy*, pp. 6190–6195.

[4] S. Goyal and M. Kearns, "Competitive contagion in networks," in *Proceedings of the 44th symposium on Theory of Computing*. ACM, 2012, pp. 759–774.

[5] L. Small and O. Mason, "Information diffusion on the iterated local transitivity model of online social networks," *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 2012.

[6] H. P. Young, "The diffusion of innovations in social networks," *Economy as an Evolving Complex System. Proceedings volume in the Santa Fe Institute Studies in the Sciences of Complexity*, vol. 3, pp. 267–282, 2002.

[7] M. Richardson and P. Domingos, "Mining knowledge-sharing sites for viral marketing," in *Proceedings of the Eighth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. ACM, 2002, pp. 61–70.

[8] Y. Singer, "How to win friends and influence people, truthfully: influence maximization mechanisms for social networks," in *Proceedings of the Fifth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*. ACM, 2012, pp. 733–742.

[9] E. Mossel and S. Roch, "Submodularity of influence in social networks: From local to global," *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 2176–2188, 2010.

[10] S. Etesami, T. Başar, A. Nedich, and B. Touri, "Termination time of multidimensional Hegselmann-Krause opinion dynamics," *Proc. 2013 American Control Conference (ACC 2013), Washington, DC, June 17-19*, pp. 1257–1262, 2013.

[11] S. Brânzei and K. Larson, "Social distance games," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence-Volume One*. AAAI Press, 2011, pp. 91–96.

[12] N. Alon, M. Feldman, A. D. Procaccia, and M. Tennenholtz, "A note on competitive diffusion through social networks," *Information Processing Letters*, vol. 110, no. 6, pp. 221–225, 2010.

[13] C. Dürr and N. K. Thang, "Nash equilibria in voronoi games on graphs," in *Algorithms–ESA 2007*. Springer, 2007, pp. 17–28.

[14] B.-G. Chun, K. Chaudhuri, H. Wee, M. Barreno, C. H. Papadimitriou, and J. Kubiatowicz, "Selfish caching in distributed systems: a game-theoretic analysis," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Distributed Computing*. ACM, 2004, pp. 21–30.

[15] S. Goyal and F. Vega-Redondo, "Learning, network formation and coordination," Tinbergen Institute, Tech. Rep., 2000.

[16] G. G. Pollatos, O. A. Telelis, and V. Zissimopoulos, "On the social cost of distributed selfish content replication," in *NETWORKING 2008 Ad Hoc and Sensor Networks, Wireless Networks, Next Generation Internet*. Springer, 2008, pp. 195–206.

[17] N. Laoutaris, O. Telelis, V. Zissimopoulos, and I. Stavrakakis, "Distributed selfish replication," *Parallel and Distributed Systems, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 17, no. 12, pp. 1401–1413, 2006.

[18] V. Pacifici and G. Dan, "Convergence in player-specific graphical resource allocation games," *Selected Areas in Communications, IEEE Journal on*, vol. 30, no. 11, pp. 2190–2199, 2012.

[19] I. Milchtaich, "Congestion games with player-specific payoff functions," *Games and Economic Behavior*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 111–124, 1996.

[20] R. Southwell and J. Huang, "Convergence dynamics of resource-homogeneous congestion games," in *Game Theory for Networks*. Springer, 2012, pp. 281–293.

[21] V. Jacobson, D. K. Smetters, J. D. Thornton, M. F. Plass, N. H. Briggs, and R. L. Braynard, "Networking named content," in *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Emerging Networking Experiments and Technologies*. ACM, 2009, pp. 1–12.

[22] M. X. Goemans, L. Li, V. S. Mirrokni, and M. Thottan, "Market sharing games applied to content distribution in ad hoc networks," *Selected Areas in Communications, IEEE Journal on*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 1020–1033, 2006.

[23] B. Bollobás, *Random graphs*. Cambridge University Press, 2001, vol. 73.

[24] A. Fabrikant, A. Luthra, E. Maneva, C. H. Papadimitriou, and S. Shenker, "On a network creation game," in *Proceedings of the twenty-second annual symposium on Principles of distributed computing*. ACM, 2003, pp. 347–351.

[25] B. Kawald and P. Lenzner, "On dynamics in selfish network creation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.4797*, 2012.